

May 6, 1987

LB 787

SENATOR WARNER: In effect, what the committee amendment says, it increases the category of agriculture recommendation by approximately \$2 million, of which included within that \$2 million would be a million and a half for Valmont, approximately, and approximately 500,000 for Hastings Pork.

SENATOR MOORE: I just wanted the body to realize once again what we were talking about here in the committee amendments.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Moore, excuse me. (Gavel.) Proceed, Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: What we are talking about here in the committee amendments is the money for both the Valmont Corporation and the Hastings Pork out at Hastings. I guess I rise, as I did in committee, to oppose these committee amendments because I think we are...you know, even though, in my own mind, I have had a problem with all this extra Exxon overcharge money, and it seems like we can use the money for very few things that we could actually...may make it worthwhile, I don't think we are setting a right precedent when we are giving the Valmont Corporation \$1.5 million. I simply cannot sign off on that. I mean, talk about economic development, I guess this is about as good an economic development as you can do when you write somebody a check for \$1.5 million to do something and I guess there is some credence to what I am saying, besides the fact that I have a problem with giving Valmont money, you know, if you look back, do you remember back to December, when there was a grant review advisory committee to score these programs, all the 104 some programs that submitted applications, where did Valmont rank? They ranked something like 91st, 91st on that scoring facility. And I will tell you who was on, there was five, six people on the committee that scored these projects. There was Linda Cabala out at Chappell, Nebraska. There was Phillip Lambert out of the Division of Energy in the Department of Natural Resources down in Missouri; Robert Robertson, an economist in Denver; Gary Targoff in our own Department of Economic Development; Allison Meyer at the Energy Office; and Beth Spaugh with the Energy Office. These people, the way I understand it, went through, evaluated these programs, and Valmont, the Valmont project ranked 92nd or 91st out of 104. There was like 60 projects above Valmont in the scoring process that received no funding, no funding at all. These projects that weren't funded that scored higher than Valmont total up to something like \$19 million, \$19 million in projects were ahead of Valmont in the scoring process. Besides that, there is another \$2 million